



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

An Old English Grammar, by Eduard Sievers. Translated by Albert S. Cook. Third edition. Boston : Ginn & Co., 1903. Pp. xxii, 422.

Sievers's grammar, in the original and in Professor Cook's translation, is so well known to all cis-Atlantic teachers and students that the present reviewer deems himself at liberty to dispense with generalities, and restrict his remarks to the distinctive features of this third edition.

In typography and presswork the American translation is superior to the German original ; the Niemeyer fount is too thin-faced. On the other hand, the German paper takes pen-and-ink insertions somewhat better.

In one other feature the translation is a decided improvement. Sievers's numerous 'Berichtigungen,' pp. 317-318 (see his note of explanation p. ix), have been scrupulously inserted by his translator in their respective places in the body of the text. Thus the American book is easier and safer to use than the German. As a specimen of the care with which this tedious process has been conducted, I would call the reader's attention to § 100.1 and 2. Only two oversights have I detected. The first is in § 389, note 4, where the sentence : 'For North. weak forms see 416, note 11.e,' should go to the end of the note, after the remarks on *spurnan* ; see 'Berichtigungen.' The second is in § 415, second line ; the reference should be to § 398.3 (instead of 389.3).

A different question is this : Has the translator always rendered his original with perfect accuracy ? I give a list of passages over which I hesitate more or less.

§ 31. 'In the older WS. documents, as well as in the other dialects, the letter <i>y</i> originally denoted a sound resembling the Germ. <i>ü</i> ,' etc.	'Das zeichen <i>y</i> drückt in den älteren ws. denkmälern und in den nichtws. dialecten stets ursprünglich einen dem deutschen <i>ü</i> ähnlichen laut . . . aus.'
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Sievers's wording is not happy ; still, after a little reflection, one sees that he is merely contrasting the elder *y* and the younger. We might render succinctly : 'In the older documents, in WS. and in the other dialects, the letter *y*,' etc.

§ 47. 'The mutation of the vowel,' etc.	'die wandlung des vocals,' etc.
-----------------------------------------	---------------------------------

In view of the circumstance that 'mutation' is used by some English scholars as a rendering of the German 'Umlaut,' it seems to me undesirable to speak of the OE. change of *ai* to *ā*, *au* to *ēa*, as 'mutation.'

§ 75, note 2. 'The *e* . . . is 'wie . . . *e* für *ie* erscheint,'
substituted for *ie*,' etc. etc.

Again Sievers is unfortunate in his wording, though his thought is correct. At any rate, 'substitute' injects a wrong notion into the matter. Put bluntly, the only correct theory is that the original OE. vowel is *e*, of which *ie* is a specific WS. variant. Consequently, if we are to speak of 'substitution' at all, we should apply the term to the WS. only.

§§ 138, 139: 'auxiliary 'secundärvocal.'
vowel.'

The phenomenon in question is OE. *fugol*, *tācen*, versus Gothic *fugl*-, *taikn*-. *Secundär* is certainly better than 'auxiliary;' but 'epenthetic' or Brugmann's 'anaptyctic' is the term which I should prefer.

§ 213, note. 'For (palatal) 'Für (palatales γ) nach *r*, *l*
g after *r*, *l* the digraph *ig* is not wird nicht selten . . . *ig* geschrie-
infrequently employed.' ben.'

Sievers having avoided the term 'digraph' for this phenomenon, there was no need of it in the translation. I notice that in § 6 both Sievers and his translator call the *æ* a 'ligature.' Is the *æ* a ligature? I have been in the habit of calling it a digraph.

§ 218.2. 'If two vowels thus 'Treten durch den ausfall des
collide through the loss of *h*,' etc. *h* vocale zusammen,' etc.

One scarcely speaks of vowels as 'colliding.' For English readers the phenomenon would be better described in a formula like this: 'When, through the dropping of the *h*, vowels are brought together, they are contracted into one syllable.'

§ 230, note 1: 'without any 'ohne deutlich sichtbaren
assignable reason.' grund.'

Sievers implies that there may be a reason, but it is not obvious. At bottom there is a tendency of the language to shorten the vowel and geminate the consonant in certain forms. For example, *usser* for *üser*; *gesīððas* for *gesīðas*, *Gen.* 2067; *geliccost*, *Elene* 1271;

mereþissan for *-þisan*, *Andr.* 257 ; *attor* for *ātor*, *Past.* 449.27. As may be seen from these few examples, the phenomenon is not peculiar to weak verbs ; neither is it restricted to the spirant consonants.

§ 239*b* : ‘*hop*, recess.’ ‘*hop* schlupfwinkel.’

The same ‘recess’ is found in the second edition. ‘Lurking-place’ would be a better definition. By the way, is *hop* found except in such compounds as *fenhop*, *mōrhop*?

287 : ‘*londbüend*, female settler.’ ‘*londbüend* colonia.’

The mistake has been retained by the translator from his second edition. *Londbüend* means ‘settlement ;’ see Toller-Bosworth. The word is interesting as an addition to the list of *-end* formations which are not *nomina agentis*.

§ 396, note 5 : ‘*ēaden*, born.’ ‘*ēaden* geboren.’

The history of this curious blunder in both German and English is interesting. Sievers in his second edition, § 396, note 2, printed ‘*ēaden* geboren,’ an evident slip for *geboten*. This was corrected in the translation of this second edition : ‘*ēaden*, given, granted.’ Yet in the third edition both original and translation repeat the old blunder. *Habent sua fata*, etc.

§ 403, note : ‘*ōrettan* battle.’ ‘*ōrettan* kämpfen.’

Is not this definition of *ōrettan* at fault? The primary meaning can only be *herausfordern*, ‘challenge ;’ the idea of fighting is secondary. This primary sense survives in the ‘*infamare georrettan*’ of the *Wr.-Wülker Glosses* 425.29 ; 523.29.

In § 1, note 1, the translator departs intentionally from Sievers in justifying the superiority of the term Old English over Anglo-Saxon. Without seeking to discuss the question here, let me remark that the *N. E. D.* is wrong in giving 1783 as the earliest date for the use of the term Anglo-Saxon to designate the language. The language was called Anglo-Saxon as early as 1589. We may expect soon from Professor Strunk a note on the point.

The foregoing criticisms, compared with the work itself, sink into insignificance. In truth, Professor Cook’s translation is a model of painstaking accuracy.

Now a few words upon the German original. Sievers’s Preface, to one who reads between the lines, sounds almost the note of an

apologia. To me in particular it suggests a reluctant excuse—may the reader pardon the abrupt change of figure—for pouring new wine into old bottles. Since the stirring days when the first edition was overturned by the *Miscellen*, and both were superseded by the second edition, seventeen years have passed, years of intense activity in all the fields of Indo-European and Germanic linguistics. At many points we have been forced to throw overboard or at least reconstruct our quondam theories. For example, how much remains of the old ablaut-system? As a purely practical matter, then, it seems to me no longer possible to squeeze a working outline of OE. phonology and morphology into Sievers's 430 sections. Some of these sections remain pretty much as they were twenty years ago; others are distorted out of all shape, more foot-note than text.

Further, despite the deftness of Sievers's *remaniement*, OE. phonology is not presented as satisfactorily as it should be. For instance, § 45, the well known *pons asinorum* of beginners, is in need of reconstruction, certainly in subsection 8:

'The Indo-European *ej* + vowel has been split into *i* + vowel and *j* + vowel: for example, in present stems like **dōmia*-, **nazja*-, etc.;

and in § 46:

'The latter [the West Germanic vowel-system], however, agrees with the Germanic system in every essential particular,' etc.;

in connection with § 410.2:

'In the forms which have *i* in the ending, that is, the ind. pres. 2 and 3 sing. and the imp. 2 sing., the *j* of the suffix was lacking as early as West Germanic, and therefore could produce no gemination.'

The student ought not to wait until he comes to the weak verbs before learning that in West Germanic the *j* is retained only before the guttural vowels *a*, *o*, *u*. And why incur the imputation of applying the syncope of *j* to gemination only? The syncope is of equal significance for the understanding of English palatalization. In fact it is our sole means of accounting for the more puzzling phenomena. I have come over to the doctrine that whereas *k* (OE. *c*) is palatalized to *tseh* before either *j* or *i*, the guttural spirant *g* (Kluge's *γ*) is palatalized to *dzh* only before *j*; before *i*

it becomes merely γ (y). The paradigm of the causative 'to lay' is: **laȝion*, OE. ME. *lēcgean* (*dzh*); **laȝiu*, **laȝis*, **laȝið*, OE. ME. *lēcge*, *lēgis*, *lēgið*. Of this distinction and its underlying principle I fail to see any mention in §§ 206–216, although in § 416 the paradigms of *secgean*, *hycgean* (not to speak of *biddan*, § 367) show plainly that the facts were present to Sievers.

Another point is the inconsistent treatment of the relation between a and α . In § 49 we are told, most correctly, that 'short a is regularly converted into α ,' etc. That is, a is primary, and α is derivative. Yet in § 240 we read that such words as *dæg*, *hwæl*, etc., 'change the α into a throughout the plural.' No, they do nothing of the sort! Primitive **day* is 'changed' to *dæg*, and **dayum* 'remains' *dagum*. Further, in § 52. 2–6, Sievers speaks of a as undergoing i -umlaut, breaking, and the like, when surely he must have in mind the α . Every theory of the phenomenon **au* > *ea* assumes an intermediate *æa* sharpened to *ea*.

One more observation. At p. 85 of his translation Professor Cook has inserted a note of his own upon ablaut; it is based upon Professor (now President) Wheeler's article in Johnson's *Encyclopedia*. At the risk of seeming ungracious, I would remark: first, that the ablaut-theory here presented is scarcely adequate to our present knowledge; secondly, that it is hardly worth while to introduce the ablaut-question in treating unstressed syllables, while ignoring it in stressed syllables.

These are the more general criticisms which I have to offer. A fair number of minor points occur to me; but I will not inflict them upon the reader, nor incur the charge of being captious with a scholarly genius whose every utterance I ponder with thankfulness. Still, I should like an interpretation of the remarks on *tygen*, *tigen*, *togen*, § 383, note 3. Why is not *glōwan*, *glēow* given in § 396.2? (see § 192, note 4). In § 266 *ðyrst* is entered in the list of i -stems. The form is not found in OE.; see Zupitza, *Engl. Stud.* 13. 394.

I hope most earnestly that Sievers will be moved before many years to give us an entirely new grammar, in which the Lautlehre at least shall be rewritten. He is the only man to do the work with entire adequacy.

J. M. HART.